REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion and in view of the present amendment, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16 are pending.

The Applicants are appreciative of the indication by the Examiner's Supervisory Examiner that the term "host" does not appear to be indefinite in light of the description in the specification.

Entry of Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116

The Applicant requests entry of this Rule 116 Response because: the response was not earlier presented because the Applicant believed in good faith that the cited references did not disclose the present invention as previously claimed.

I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

In the Office Action, at page 2, claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as being failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

Claim 11 recites "a signal inputting unit receiving R,G,B video signals, a horizontal synchronization signal and a vertical synchronization signal from a host of a computer system." Claim 11 does not recite "a signal inputting unit receiving an R,G,B video signals from a host computer," as alleged by the Examiner in the Office Action. Claim 11 clearly recites that the signals are received from a host of a computer system. Paragraph 0003 recites that "computer systems include a host and a display device." Thus, it is clear that the host is a host of a computer system. Further, Merriam-Webster's online dictionary recites that the definition of a host, in relation to a computer system, is "a computer that controls communications in a network or that administers a database; also: server," enclosed wherewith. Therefore, it is clear that in the context of a computer system, a host is clearly a host computer that controls communications, for example, by sending signals.

Additionally, the term "host," in relation to a computer system, is a term that is well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art. In order to fail to comply with the enablement requirement, the claim must contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Here, the specification describes that a host sends RGB signals, a horizontal synchronization signal and a vertical synchronization signal that are received by the

display device. *See* paragraph 0004. Thus, a host clearly must be a device that is able to transmit signals to a display device. Therefore, a host must inherently be a host computer.

In addition, a quick search of the USPTO database shows 34,338 occurrences of the term "host" in the claims, without the term "host computer." It would therefore be clear to one of ordinary skill in the art as to what the term "host" refers.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 112, first paragraph, rejection is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, at page 3, claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,644,325 to King et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,809,366 to Yamakawa et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed because the combination of the teachings of King and Yamakawa does not suggest:

> selecting one of an R, a G, or a B component of the R,G,B signal including the video signal as a selected one R,G, or B component and setting a region of the selected one R,G, or B component as a checked region which is checked;
>
> detecting a minimum pixel level value in the checked region;
>
> comparing the minimum pixel level value for the selected one R,G, or B component with a predetermined threshold value to determine whether an abnormal R,G, or B component is present, the abnormal R,G, or B component being a component abnormally input due to malfunction of the host; and
>
> displaying on a screen a message indicating whether the selected one R,G, or B component includes a video signal abnormally input due to the malfunction of the host,

as recited in independent claim 1.

The Examiner alleges that, as the user can program the size and location of the video window 36 using a selected color key in King, the selected color key corresponds with a color component and the position and size of the window correspond with a selected region of an R, G or B component of an R, G, B signal. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

King discusses that the size and location of the video window 36 may be programmed by the user using a selected color key, and discusses that the digital RGB signals corresponding to the selected color key are then stored in the VGA frame buffer. Thus, the selected color key in King is not a **single** color component of an RGB signal (i.e., the selected color key is not **one** of the R, G or B components of the RGB signal).

Even assuming, *arguendo*, that a selected color key could be construed to be a single color component of an RGB signal, the size of a video window 36 itself could not be construed to be a region of a selected one of the R, G or B components of an RGB signal. The size of the window is not a region of a component **of a signal**.

The Examiner then alleges that a color key range is an inherent teaching of a minimum and maximum pixel level, and that the color key range is compared with an analog color signal to determine whether the analog color signal is within the preselected range.

First, King specifically discusses that the selected digital color key value (**in an RGB format**) is converted to an **RGB** analog value. Thus, King clearly discusses that the color signal is an RGB signal. King **does not** discuss or suggest that the color signal is **one of the components** of an RGB signal. King also does not suggest that the color range is a minimum pixel level value **of a checked region of *one* component** of an RGB signal.

In addition, the Examiner states at page 8 of the Final Office Action that "examiner fails to see said language as being claimed" in relation to the Applicant alleging that "King does not discuss or suggest that a region of a selected R, G or B component is set as a region to be checked." The Applicant respectfully draws the Examiner's attention to the recitation of claim 1, which recites "setting a region of the selected one R, G, or B component as a checked region which is checked." Thus, it is entirely unclear as to how the Examiner fails to understand that the region of a selected R, G or B component is set as a region which is checked. King does not discuss setting a region of a selected R, G or B component as a checked region which is checked. King makes no discussion or suggestion of setting a region as a checked region.

Further, even though King discusses comparing an analog color signal with a color key range to determine whether the analog color signal is within the range, King does not discuss or suggest detecting a minimum pixel level value in a checked region of a selected one R, G or B component and comparing the minimum pixel level value for the selected one R,G, or B component with a predetermined threshold value to determine whether an abnormal R,G, or B component is present, the abnormal R,G, or B component being a component abnormally input due to malfunction of the host.

In addition, as conceded by the Examiner, Yamakawa does not discuss receiving an RGB signal including a video signal, a horizontal and a vertical synchronization signal.

The Examiner alleges that Yamakawa makes up for the deficiencies in King. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

First, as Yamakawa is directed to a method and system for calibrating color copiers, the color copier is not receiving an RGB signal including a video signal, a horizontal synchronization signal and a vertical synchronization signal. The Examiner cited figures 3-5 in alleging that Yamakawa teaches a signal input unit receiving R,G,B signals, a horizontal and vertical synchronization signal. However, Yamakawa does not discuss or suggest receiving an RGB signal including horizontal and vertical synchronization signals, as the format of a color copier does not require receiving an RGB signal including a video signal and synchronization signals. The Examiner has failed to cite where in Yamakawa that Yamakawa teaches such.

In addition, Yamakawa discusses that points 530-533 in a frame are analyzed in order to determine the exact colors defining the point, and when the colors of these points deviate the expected result by more than an allowable range, it can be determined that the image data was not properly read or input **in a scanning operation of a digital copier** and a warning for urging the user the execute the **scanning** again or repeat the process can be displayed.

Yamakawa does not detect a **minimum pixel value *in a checked region*** of **one of** an R, G or B component of an RGB signal. There is no indication that a minimum pixel value is detected in a checked region of one component of an RGB signal, but only that points on the frame are analyzed to determine whether the colors of those points deviate from the expected result (not that a minimum pixel value in a checked region of a color component of an RGB signal deviates from an allowable range).

Further, Yamakawa does not suggest that a minimum pixel value for the selected R, G or B component is compared with a predetermined threshold value to determine whether an abnormal R, G or B **component** is present, the abnormal component being input due to malfunction **of the host**. Here, the "malfunction" is only of the scanned copy of the image. The malfunction is not of the host of a computer system. In addition, the malfunction is of the image data, but not of a **component** of the RGB signal that is abnormally input due to the host's malfunction.

In addition, while a warning is displayed that indicates that the **image data** was not properly read or input, the warning is not a message that indicates whether a selected R, G or B component includes a **video signal** abnormally input due to the malfunction of the host of the computer system. The image here is not a video signal that is determined to be abnormally input due to a malfunction of a host, but is merely an image that is determined to not have been properly scanned.

Also, the Examiner alleges that a minimum pixel value is equivalent to a range. The Applicants respectfully disagree. While the term "range" may correspond to a minimum value, the term "minimum pixel value" is distinct from a mere indication of a bottom limit of a range and is a term well known in the art. Yamakawa does not disclose a minimum pixel value and in particular does not disclose a minimum pixel value in a checked region **of an R, G or B component** of an RGB signal. Yamakawa does not indicate that the colors of the points are a detected minimum pixel value of a checked region of a **component of an RGB signal**.

Additionally, the cited motivation does not indicate how one of ordinary skill in the art would have been led to combine the **color copier** of Yamakawa with the multimedia system which receives signals of King to suggest all the features of independent claim 1. Providing a color balance selection method which allows a user to select the color balance relative to the calibrated standard of an image processing device and therefore reproduce colors contained in a specific image chosen by a user does not suggest how one of ordinary skill would have been led to incorporate the method of calibrating a color copier into the multimedia system of King to suggest comparing a minimum pixel level value in a checked region for a selected one R, G or B component with a predetermined threshold value to determine whether an abnormal R, G or B component is present, the abnormal R, G or B component being a component **abnormally input due to the malfunction of the host** of a computer system.

While King may teach a host, as the Examiner alleges at page 10 of the Final Office Action, Yamakawa does not also suggest that a video signal is analyzed which comes from a host of a computer system. There is no indication that the color copier of Yamakawa could be incorporated into the multimedia system of King, particularly because Yamakawa does not suggest receiving a video signal. Making a scanned copy of a picture is not receiving a **video signal** from a host and it is entirely unclear as to how the scanned copy of a picture could be construed to be a video signal or be incorporated into a system with a video signal. The cited motivation does not indicate as to how this incorporation could be managed.

In addition, the Examiner alleges that the language of "displaying a message indicating whether a selected component includes a video signal abnormally input due to the malfunction of the host," "receive from a host an RGB signal," and "the host is the transmitter of the RGB signal" is language that is absent from claim 1. Claim 1 recites "displaying on a screen a message indicating whether the selected one R, G, or B component includes a video signal abnormally input due to the malfunction of the host" and "receiving an R, G, B signal...from a host of the computer system." It is therefore entirely unclear as to how claim 1, for example,

does not recite the language asserted above. If an RGB signal was received from a host of a computer system, then the host **inherently** sent the RGB signal. It is inherent that if the signal came from the host, then the host transmitted the signal. Claim 1, for example, **requires** that the RGB signal **be received** from a host of a computer system.

The Examiner alleges that the malfunction as claimed and the deviation as disclosed in Yamakawa are interpreted as equivalent. However, Yamakawa does not suggest that the deviation of a color from an allowable range is an indication of a malfunction **of a host**, where the host is a host of a computer system. The Examiner has given no indication that the color deviation from an allowable range is in any way associated with a malfunction of a host of a computer system. Further, as the color copier is only concerned with calibrating the colors output by the image processing system of the copier, it is entirely unclear as to how calibrating a color such that the color is within an allowable range **is a *malfunction* or indicates a malfunction of a host of a computer system, particularly with respect to a signal, including horizontal and vertical synchronization signals, that is being received**.

Therefore, as the combination of the teachings of King and Yamakawa does not suggest "selecting one of an R, a G, or a B component of the R,G,B signal including the video signal as a selected one R,G, or B component and setting a region of the selected one R,G, or B component as a checked region which is checked; detecting a minimum pixel level value in the checked region; comparing the minimum pixel level value for the selected one R,G, or B component with a predetermined threshold value to determine whether an abnormal R,G, or B component is present, the abnormal R,G, or B component being a component abnormally input due to malfunction of the host; and displaying on a screen a message indicating whether the selected one R,G, or B component includes a video signal abnormally input due to the malfunction of the host," as recited in independent claim 1, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the references relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Also, the combination of the teachings of King and Yamakawa does not suggest:

> a signal inputting unit receiving R,G,B signals from a host of a computer system including video signals, a horizontal synchronization signal, and a vertical synchronization signal;
>
> a minimum value detector detecting a minimum pixel level value in a particular region of a selected one of an R, a G, or a B component input from the signal inputting unit, the selected one R,G, or B component being an R, a G, or a B component of the received R,G,B signals;

> a controller comparing the minimum pixel level value with a predetermined value to determine whether the selected one R,G, or B component includes an abnormal video signal caused by malfunction of the host; and a warning message indicating an abnormal state of the selected one R,G, or B component caused by malfunction of the host, as determined by the controller,

as recited in independent claim 4.

King specifically discusses that the selected digital color key value (**in an RGB format**) is converted to an **RGB** analog value. Thus, King clearly discusses that the color signal is an RGB signal. King **does not** discuss or suggest that the color signal is **one of the components** of an RGB signal. King also does not suggest that the color range is a minimum pixel level value **of a checked region of *one* component** of an RGB signal.

In addition, the Examiner states at page 8 of the Final Office Action that "examiner fails to see said language as being claimed" in relation to the Applicant alleging that "King does not discuss or suggest that a region of a selected R, G or B component is set as a region to be checked." The Applicant respectfully draws the Examiner's attention to the recitation of claim 1, which recites "setting a region of the selected one R, G, or B component as a checked region which is checked." Thus, it is entirely unclear as to how the Examiner fails to understand that the region of a selected R, G or B component is set as a region which is checked. King does not discuss setting a region of a selected R, G or B component as a checked region which is checked. King makes no discussion or suggestion of setting a region as a checked region.

Further, even though King discusses comparing an analog color signal with a color key range to determine whether the analog color signal is within the range, King does not discuss or suggest detecting a minimum pixel level value in a checked region of a selected one R, G or B component and comparing the minimum pixel level value for the selected one R,G, or B component with a predetermined threshold value to determine whether an abnormal R,G, or B component is present, the abnormal R,G, or B component being a component abnormally input due to malfunction of the host.

The Examiner alleges that Yamakawa makes up for the deficiencies in King. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Yamakawa discusses that points 530-533 in a frame are analyzed in order to determine the exact colors defining the point, and when the colors of these points deviate the expected result by more than an allowable range, it can be determined that the image data was not

properly read or input **in a scanning operation of a digital copier** and a warning for urging the user the execute the **scanning** again or repeat the process can be displayed.

Yamakawa does not detect a **minimum pixel value *in a checked region*** of **one of** an R, G or B component of an RGB signal. There is no indication that a minimum pixel value is detected in a checked region of one component of an RGB signal, but only that points on the frame are analyzed to determine whether the colors of those points deviate from the expected result (not that a minimum pixel value in a checked region of a the color component of an RGB signal deviates from an allowable range).

Further, Yamakawa does not suggest that a minimum pixel value for the selected R, G or B component is compared with a predetermined threshold value to determine whether an abnormal R, G or B **component** is present, the abnormal component being input due to malfunction **of the host**. Here, the "malfunction" is only of the scanned copy of the image. The malfunction is not of the host of a computer system. In addition, the malfunction is of the image data, but not of a **component** of the RGB signal that is abnormally input due to the host's malfunction.

In addition, while a warning is displayed that indicates that the **image data** was not properly read or input, the warning is not a message that indicates whether a selected R, G or B component includes a **video signal** abnormally input due to the malfunction of the host of the computer system. The image here is not a video signal that is determined to be abnormally input due to a malfunction of a host, but is merely an image that is determined to not have been properly scanned.

Therefore, claim 4 patentably distinguishes over the references relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

In addition, the combination of the teachings of King and Yamakawa does not suggest:

> detecting a minimum pixel level value of an R, a G, or a B component selected from the received R,G,B signals, the selected one R,G, or B, component being an R, a G, or a B component of the received R,G,B signals;
>
> determining whether the selected one R,G, or B component is abnormally input due to malfunction of the host, based on a comparison between the minimum pixel level value in the selected one R,G, or B component and a predetermined value; and
>
> displaying on a screen a message indicating whether the selected one R,G, or B component includes a video signal abnormally input due to the malfunction of the host,

as recited in independent claim 7.

King specifically discusses that the selected digital color key value (**in an RGB format**) is converted to an **RGB** analog value. Thus, King clearly discusses that the color signal is an RGB signal. King **does not** discuss or suggest that the color signal is **one of the components** of an RGB signal. King also does not suggest that the color range is a minimum pixel level value **of a checked region of *one* component** of an RGB signal.

In addition, the Examiner states at page 8 of the Final Office Action that "examiner fails to see said language as being claimed" in relation to the Applicant alleging that "King does not discuss or suggest that a region of a selected R, G or B component is set as a region to be checked." The Applicant respectfully draws the Examiner's attention to the recitation of claim 1, which recites "setting a region of the selected one R, G, or B component as a checked region which is checked." Thus, it is entirely unclear as to how the Examiner fails to understand that the region of a selected R, G or B component is set as a region which is checked. King does not discuss setting a region of a selected R, G or B component as a checked region which is checked. King makes no discussion or suggestion of setting a region as a checked region.

Further, even though King discusses comparing an analog color signal with a color key range to determine whether the analog color signal is within the range, King does not discuss or suggest detecting a minimum pixel level value in a checked region of a selected one R, G or B component and comparing the minimum pixel level value for the selected one R,G, or B component with a predetermined threshold value to determine whether an abnormal R,G, or B component is present, the abnormal R,G, or B component being a component abnormally input due to malfunction of the host.

The Examiner alleges that Yamakawa makes up for the deficiencies in King. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Yamakawa discusses that points 530-533 in a frame are analyzed in order to determine the exact colors defining the point, and when the colors of these points deviate the expected result by more than an allowable range, it can be determined that the image data was not properly read or input **in a scanning operation of a digital copier** and a warning for urging the user the execute the **scanning** again or repeat the process can be displayed.

Yamakawa does not detect a **minimum pixel value *in a checked region*** of **one of** an R, G or B component of an RGB signal. There is no indication that a minimum pixel value is detected in a checked region of one component of an RGB signal, but only that points on the

frame are analyzed to determine whether the colors of those points deviate from the expected result (not that a minimum pixel value in a checked region of a the color component of an RGB signal deviates from an allowable range).

Further, Yamakawa does not suggest that a minimum pixel value for the selected R, G or B component is compared with a predetermined threshold value to determine whether an abnormal R, G or B **component** is present, the abnormal component being input due to malfunction **of the host**. Here, the "malfunction" is only of the scanned copy of the image. The malfunction is not of the host of a computer system. In addition, the malfunction is of the image data, but not of a **component** of the RGB signal that is abnormally input due to the host's malfunction.

In addition, while a warning is displayed that indicates that the **image data** was not properly read or input, the warning is not a message that indicates whether a selected R, G or B component includes a **video signal** abnormally input due to the malfunction of the host of the computer system. The image here is not a video signal that is determined to be abnormally input due to a malfunction of a host, but is merely an image that is determined to not have been properly scanned.

Therefore, claim 7 patentably distinguishes over the references relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

The combination of the teachings of King and Yamakawa also does not suggest:

> an abnormal state detector detecting an abnormal video signal in an R, a G, or a B component caused by malfunction of the host, the R, a G, or a B component selected from among the received R,G,B signals based on a comparison of a detected pixel level value of the selected one R,G, or B component and a predetermined value, the selected one R,G, or B component being an R, a G, or a B component of the received R,G,B signals; and a warning message indicator indicating whether a video signal abnormally input due to the malfunction of the host is detected,

as recited in independent claim 11.

King specifically discusses that the selected digital color key value (**in an RGB format**) is converted to an **RGB** analog value. Thus, King clearly discusses that the color signal is an RGB signal. King **does not** discuss or suggest that the color signal is **one of the components** of an RGB signal. King also does not suggest that the color range is a minimum pixel level value **of a checked region of *one* component** of an RGB signal.

In addition, the Examiner states at page 8 of the Final Office Action that "examiner fails to see said language as being claimed" in relation to the Applicant alleging that "King does not discuss or suggest that a region of a selected R, G or B component is set as a region to be checked." The Applicant respectfully draws the Examiner's attention to the recitation of claim 1, which recites "setting a region of the selected one R, G, or B component as a checked region which is checked." Thus, it is entirely unclear as to how the Examiner fails to understand that the region of a selected R, G or B component is set as a region which is checked. King does not discuss setting a region of a selected R, G or B component as a checked region which is checked. King makes no discussion or suggestion of setting a region as a checked region.

Further, even though King discusses comparing an analog color signal with a color key range to determine whether the analog color signal is within the range, King does not discuss or suggest detecting a minimum pixel level value in a checked region of a selected one R, G or B component and comparing the minimum pixel level value for the selected one R,G, or B component with a predetermined threshold value to determine whether an abnormal R,G, or B component is present, the abnormal R,G, or B component being a component abnormally input due to malfunction of the host.

The Examiner alleges that Yamakawa makes up for the deficiencies in King. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Yamakawa discusses that points 530-533 in a frame are analyzed in order to determine the exact colors defining the point, and when the colors of these points deviate the expected result by more than an allowable range, it can be determined that the image data was not properly read or input **in a scanning operation of a digital copier** and a warning for urging the user the execute the **scanning** again or repeat the process can be displayed.

Yamakawa does not detect a **minimum pixel value *in a checked region*** of **one of** an R, G or B component of an RGB signal. There is no indication that a minimum pixel value is detected in a checked region of one component of an RGB signal, but only that points on the frame are analyzed to determine whether the colors of those points deviate from the expected result (not that a minimum pixel value in a checked region of a the color component of an RGB signal deviates from an allowable range).

Further, Yamakawa does not suggest that a minimum pixel value for the selected R, G or B component is compared with a predetermined threshold value to determine whether an abnormal R, G or B **component** is present, the abnormal component being input due to malfunction **of the host**. Here, the "malfunction" is only of the scanned copy of the image. The

malfunction is not of the host of a computer system. In addition, the malfunction is of the image data, but not of a **component** of the RGB signal that is abnormally input due to the host's malfunction.

In addition, while a warning is displayed that indicates that the **image data** was not properly read or input, the warning is not a message that indicates whether a selected R, G or B component includes a **video signal** abnormally input due to the malfunction of the host of the computer system. The image here is not a video signal that is determined to be abnormally input due to a malfunction of a host, but is merely an image that is determined to not have been properly scanned.

Therefore, claim 11 patentably distinguishes over the references relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Further, the combination of the teachings of King and Yamakawa also does not suggest:

> selecting each of an R, a G, and a B component from an R,G,B signal received from a host of a computer system as a selected R,G, and B component and setting a region of the selected R,G, and B component as a checked region;
>
> comparing the minimum pixel level value for the selected R,G, and B components with a predetermined threshold value to determine whether an abnormal R,G, and B component is present due to malfunction of the host, the abnormal R,G, or B component being a component abnormally input due to malfunction of the host; and
>
> displaying a message on a screen indicating whether the selected R,G, and B component includes a video signal abnormally input due to the malfunction of the host,

as recited in independent claim 16.

King specifically discusses that the selected digital color key value (**in an RGB format**) is converted to an **RGB** analog value. Thus, King clearly discusses that the color signal is an RGB signal. King **does not** discuss or suggest that the color signal is **one of the components** of an RGB signal. King also does not suggest that the color range is a minimum pixel level value **of a checked region of *one* component** of an RGB signal.

In addition, the Examiner states at page 8 of the Final Office Action that "examiner fails to see said language as being claimed" in relation to the Applicant alleging that "King does not discuss or suggest that a region of a selected R, G or B component is set as a region to be checked." The Applicant respectfully draws the Examiner's attention to the recitation of claim 1, which recites "setting a region of the selected one R, G, or B component as a checked region

which is checked." Thus, it is entirely unclear as to how the Examiner fails to understand that the region of a selected R, G or B component is set as a region which is checked. King does not discuss setting a region of a selected R, G or B component as a checked region which is checked. King makes no discussion or suggestion of setting a region as a checked region.

Further, even though King discusses comparing an analog color signal with a color key range to determine whether the analog color signal is within the range, King does not discuss or suggest detecting a minimum pixel level value in a checked region of a selected one R, G or B component and comparing the minimum pixel level value for the selected one R,G, or B component with a predetermined threshold value to determine whether an abnormal R,G, or B component is present, the abnormal R,G, or B component being a component abnormally input due to malfunction of the host.

The Examiner alleges that Yamakawa makes up for the deficiencies in King. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Yamakawa discusses that points 530-533 in a frame are analyzed in order to determine the exact colors defining the point, and when the colors of these points deviate the expected result by more than an allowable range, it can be determined that the image data was not properly read or input **in a scanning operation of a digital copier** and a warning for urging the user the execute the **scanning** again or repeat the process can be displayed.

Yamakawa does not detect a **minimum pixel value *in a checked region*** of **one of** an R, G or B component of an RGB signal. There is no indication that a minimum pixel value is detected in a checked region of one component of an RGB signal, but only that points on the frame are analyzed to determine whether the colors of those points deviate from the expected result (not that a minimum pixel value in a checked region of a the color component of an RGB signal deviates from an allowable range).

Further, Yamakawa does not suggest that a minimum pixel value for the selected R, G or B component is compared with a predetermined threshold value to determine whether an abnormal R, G or B **component** is present, the abnormal component being input due to malfunction **of the host**. Here, the "malfunction" is only of the scanned copy of the image. The malfunction is not of the host of a computer system. In addition, the malfunction is of the image data, but not of a **component** of the RGB signal that is abnormally input due to the host's malfunction.

In addition, while a warning is displayed that indicates that the **image data** was not properly read or input, the warning is not a message that indicates whether a selected R, G or B component includes a **video signal** abnormally input due to the malfunction of the host of the computer system. The image here is not a video signal that is determined to be abnormally input due to a malfunction of a host, but is merely an image that is determined to not have been properly scanned.

Therefore, claim 16 patentably distinguishes over the references relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8-10 and 12-15 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 4, 7 and 11 and include all the features of their respective independent claims, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. For example, claim 2 recites that "the comparing comprises: setting a flag which indicates whether the selected one R,G, or B component is abnormal when the minimum pixel level value is smaller than a predetermined threshold value, and resetting the flag when the minimum pixel level value is larger than the predetermined threshold value." Therefore, claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8-10 and 12-15 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1-16 are pending and under consideration.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: May 29, 2008

By: _____
Kari P. Footland
Registration No. 55,187

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

host

8 entries found.

host[1,noun]
host[2,intransitive verb]
host[3,noun]
host[4,transitive verb]
host[5,noun]
definitive host
graft-versus-host disease
intermediate host

Main Entry: **³host**
Function: *noun*
Etymology: Middle English *hoste* host, guest, from Anglo-French, from Latin *hospit-, hospes,* probably from *hostis*
Date: 14th century

1 a : one that receives or entertains guests socially, commercially, or officially **b** : one that provides facilities for an event or function <our college served as *host* for the basketball tournament>
2 a : a living animal or plant on or in which a parasite lives **b** : the larger, stronger, or dominant member of a commensal or symbiotic pair **c** : an individual into which a tissue, part, or embryo is transplanted from another
3 : a mineral or rock that is older than the minerals or rocks in it; *also* : a substance that contains a usually small amount of another substance incorporated in its structure
4 : a radio or television emcee
5 : a computer that controls communications in a network or that administers a database; *also* : SERVER 6

Pronunciation Symbols

Share this entry:

Link to this page:
host

Cite this page:

MLA Style
"host." Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary. 2008.
Merriam-Webster Online. 29 May 2008
<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/host>

APA Style
host. (2008). In *Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary*.
Retrieved May 29, 2008, from http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/host